

# Continuum Equations for Stellar Dynamics\*

Edward A. Spiegel<sup>†</sup>

*Department of Astronomy, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027*

Jean-Luc Thiffeault<sup>‡</sup>

*Department of Applied Physics and Applied Mathematics, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027*

The description of a stellar system as a continuous fluid represents a convenient first approximation to stellar dynamics, and its derivation from the kinetic theory is standard. The challenge lies in providing adequate closure approximations for the higher-order moments of the phase-space density function that appear in the fluid dynamical equations. Such closure approximations may be found using representations of the phase-space density as embodied in the kinetic theory. In the classic approach of Chapman and Enskog, one is led to the Navier–Stokes equations, which are known to be inaccurate when the mean free paths of particles are long, as they are in many stellar systems. To improve on the fluid description, we derive here a modified closure relation using a Fokker–Planck collision operator. To illustrate the nature of our approximation, we apply it to the study of gravitational instability. The instability proceeds in a qualitative manner as given by the Navier–Stokes equations but, in our description, the damped modes are considerably closer to marginality, especially at small scales.

## I. A KINETIC EQUATION

If we have a system of  $N$  stars, with  $N$  very large, and wish to study its large-scale dynamics, we have to choose the level of detail we can profitably treat. Even if we could know the positions and velocities of all  $N$  stars for all times, we would be mainly interested in the global properties that are implied by this information. For just such reasons, many investigators prefer to find an approach that leads directly to a macroscopic description of the dynamics. As Ogorodnikov (1965) has put it, “In order to exhibit more clearly the kinematics of highly rarefied media, and of stellar systems in particular, it is useful to make a comparison with the motion of a fluid.” However, traditional methods for deriving fluid equations are effective only for media in which the mean free paths of constituent particles are very short compared to all macroscopic scales of interest. This condition is not met in many stellar systems and plasmas and so we here describe an approach that is effective for deriving fluid equations for rarefied media such as stellar systems.

The first problem we must face is to decide what the kinetic description of a stellar dynamical system ought to be. Since an  $N$ -body description is not what we want to work with,

---

\*Published in *Stellar Astrophysical Fluid Dynamics: Proceedings of the Chateau de Mons meeting in honour of Douglas Gough's 60th birthday* (Cambridge University Press, 2003).

<sup>†</sup>Electronic address: [eas@astro.columbia.edu](mailto:eas@astro.columbia.edu)

<sup>‡</sup>Electronic address: [jeanluc@mailaps.org](mailto:jeanluc@mailaps.org)

even if we could, since that approach would have us computing the complicated trajectory of the stellar system through a phase space with large dimension. So we go straight to the description of the system in the six-dimensional phase space whose coordinates are the spatial coordinates ( $x^i$ ) and the velocities ( $v^i$ ) of the  $N$  stars, where  $i = 1, 2, 3$ .

A plot of the locations of each of the  $N$  stars in the six-dimensional phase space at some given time, would reveal a swarm of points whose detailed description would also be too complicated for us, at least in a first look at the problem. So instead, we concentrate on an ensemble mean of such a description and seek an equation for the density distribution of this mean. That equation, on which we base this work, is an evolution or continuity equation for the probability density in the six-dimensional phase space.

Since we treat the stars as points, the true density  $F$  in the six-dimensional phase space is a summation of delta functions at suitable locations. This density is advected by a six-dimensional phase velocity that Hamilton's equations tell us is solenoidal. Hence the total time derivative of the density is

$$\mathcal{D}F = 0 \quad (1)$$

where the comoving derivative in phase space is defined as

$$\mathcal{D} := \partial_t + \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} + \mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{v}} \quad (2)$$

and the subscripts  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{v}$  on the gradient symbols indicate that they are gradients with respect to position and velocity respectively. As usual,  $\mathbf{v} = \dot{\mathbf{x}}$  where the dot means total time derivative and the quantity  $\mathbf{a}$  is the gravitational acceleration per unit mass; we assume that all the stars in the system have the same mass,  $m$ . The gravitational acceleration is given by the gradient of the gravitational potential per unit mass, which is a solution of Poisson's equation,

$$\Delta\Phi = 4\pi G \int F \, d^3v. \quad (3)$$

Let  $f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}, t)$  be the ensemble mean of  $F$ . Then the total density will be  $F = f + \hat{f}$  where  $\hat{f}$  represents the fluctuations about the ensemble mean;  $\hat{f}$  will involve the same summation of delta functions as does  $F$  plus a smooth background distribution with negative mass density arranged so that the ensemble average of  $\hat{f}$  is zero. We similarly split the gravitational potential  $\Phi$  into an ensemble mean part  $\phi$  plus a fluctuating part  $\hat{\phi}$ . Then, if we take the ensemble average of (1), we obtain

$$\partial_t f + \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} f + (\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \phi) \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{v}} f = -\langle (\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \hat{\phi}) \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{v}} \hat{f} \rangle, \quad (4)$$

where

$$\Delta\phi = 4\pi G \int f \, d^3v. \quad (5)$$

The terms on the left hand side of (4) describe how the mean phase density, or distribution function,  $f$ , streams through the single-particle phase space. The right side represents the mean influence on the evolution of  $f$  exerted by the average of the fluctuation-interaction term. The latter represents the self-interactions of the system caused by fluctuating effects and may be thought of as representing the influence of collective modes (such as waves or quasiparticles) on the motions of the individual particles.

It is typical that the chance of close approaches of two stars in many stellar systems is small. Because of this, one commonly made approximation is to neglect the right side of (4)

completely and so work with what is called the collisionless Boltzmann (or Vlasov) equation. More reasonably perhaps, one may try to give an expression for the way the self-interaction term affects the flow of the phase density through the phase space.

As in Boltzmann theory, we shall suppose that the right side of (4) may be expressed as a functional of  $f$  itself so that the kinetic equation is deterministic. That is, we assume that the kinetic equation takes the form

$$\partial_t f + \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} f + (\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \phi) \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{v}} f = \mathcal{C}[f] \quad (6)$$

where  $\mathcal{C}[\cdot]$  may be called a collision term in keeping with the terminology of kinetic theory even though it does not arise from direct binary collisions. This approach may be acceptable because it appears that the fluid description that we seek is not very sensitive to the details of the right side of (4). On the other hand, we must admit that this hope is founded on a very limited range of trial forms since the job of deriving the consequences of each form is laborious. Our aim here is to adopt one standard form for the collision term and use it to go on to a coarser description of the stellar system like that of fluid dynamics.

The parallel to the Boltzmann theory has been used to good effect in the study of plasma physics, as in the work of Rosenbluth *et al.* (1957). As Clemmow and Dougherty (1969) explain, those authors obtained their results by “expanding the Boltzmann collision operator under the approximation that all the deflections are small angle and cutting off the impact parameter at about the Debye length. . . . At first sight the success of that method is surprising, as any treatment dealing with binary collisions would seem to be discredited. The physical reason for the agreement is that, for the majority of particles, there is little difference between a succession of numerous small-angle collisions (regarded as instantaneous and occurring at random) and the stochastic deflections due to the presence of many nearby particles continually exerting weak forces. These two pictures of the dynamics are of course represented respectively by the Boltzmann and the Fokker–Planck” approaches.

Similar thoughts have been expressed in the context of stellar dynamics, most recently by Griv *et al.* (2001) and by kinetic theorists generally. As E. G. D. Cohen reports (1997), “when Academician Bogolubov and I discussed the nature of kinetic equations, he mentioned a discussion he had had with Professor A. Vlasov, where they had agreed that: *Yes, in first approximation the kinetic equations for gases with strong short-range forces (i.e. the Boltzmann equation) and for gases with long-range forces (i.e. the Vlasov equation) differ, but in higher approximations they will become more and more similar.* How right they were.” A formal theory to buttress these remarks would be very comforting, but though we do not have one we shall adopt the point of view that the Fokker–Planck terms capture the essence of interactions of the stars in the system. Having thus supported our approach by the appeal to authority, we turn to the main purpose of this work, the derivation of continuum mechanics from the microscopic theory in a way that is not severely restricted to the case of short mean free paths.

## II. THE COLLISION TERM

In the spirit of standard kinetic theories, we shall suppose that the effect of the collision term is to drive the system toward a local equilibrium, though the correct equilibrium of a stellar system is not known on purely theoretical grounds. The tendency to approach an equilibrium seems not even to require a collision term of the usual kind since the violent relaxation described by Lynden-Bell apparently can do the job. Nevertheless, we shall

proceed in terms of the kinetic theory under the assumption that the spreading of the phase fluid through the phase space may be effected by a collision term. Furthermore, though the gravitational force has long range in physical space, we shall presume that this spreading takes the form of a diffusion of  $f$  through velocity space, that is, by the agency of a Fokker–Planck form of the collision term. (This may not be completely unfounded since there seems to exist a form of gravitational shielding (Spiegel, 1998) that may support the idea of local behaviour.) In this spirit, we write

$$\mathcal{C}[f] = \frac{\partial}{\partial v^i} \left[ -A^i f + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial v^j} (B^{ij} f) \right]. \quad (7)$$

The coefficients  $A^i$  and  $B^{ij}$  are generally functions of  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}, t)$  and they may also be functionals of  $f$ . In this discussion, the choice of these coefficients in the Fokker–Planck description is adapted to the equilibrium that is expected or assumed. This equilibrium is a local one that satisfies the condition  $\mathcal{C}[f_0] = 0$ .

Our goal is to find equations that govern the dynamics of the macroscopic properties of the fluid embodied in the density, temperature and velocity. These are defined as:

$$\text{Mass density} \quad \rho := \int m f \, d^3 v, \quad (8)$$

$$\text{Mean velocity} \quad \mathbf{u} := \frac{1}{\rho} \int m \mathbf{v} f \, d^3 v, \quad (9)$$

$$\text{Temperature} \quad T := \frac{m}{3R\rho} \int c^2 f \, d^3 v, \quad (10)$$

where the *peculiar velocity* is

$$\mathbf{c}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}, t) := \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}, t), \quad (11)$$

and  $R = k/m$ ,  $k$  being Boltzmann’s constant.

As to the nature of  $\mathcal{C}[f]$ , we shall design it so that it produces what may be the simplest plausible equilibrium, namely the Maxwell–Boltzmann distribution

$$f_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}, t) = \frac{\rho}{m(2\pi RT)^{3/2}} \exp \left( -\frac{c^2}{2RT} \right). \quad (12)$$

Since  $T, \rho$  and  $\mathbf{u}$  generally depend on  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $t$ , this is a local equilibrium and we choose (Clemmow and Dougherty, 1969)

$$A^i = -\tau^{-1}(v^i - u^i), \quad B^{ij} = 2\tau^{-1} R T \delta^{ij}, \quad (13)$$

so that  $\mathcal{C}[f_0] = 0$ . We assume that the mean-free-time  $\tau$  is a constant so that the Fokker–Planck operator is linear in  $f$ .

The collision term adopted here ensures the conservation of mass, momentum and energy in the system. This is reflected in the property

$$\int \psi^\alpha \mathcal{C}[f] \, d^3 v = 0, \quad \alpha = 0, \dots, 4, \quad (14)$$

where

$$\psi^\alpha = m \left( 1, \mathbf{v}, \frac{1}{2} v^2 \right). \quad (15)$$

Thus we neglect the possible effects of dissipative processes and of evaporation of stars from the system.

The macroscopic quantities (8)–(10) enter the equilibrium state (12) about which we are expanding. To ensure that the same macroscopic quantities that follow from  $f$  are those that determine  $f_0$ , we impose a consistency requirement known as the *matching conditions*,

$$\int \psi^\alpha f \, d^3v = \int \psi^\alpha f_0 \, d^3v, \quad \alpha = 0, \dots, 4. \quad (16)$$

### III. FLUID EQUATIONS

When we multiply the kinetic equation (6) by the collisional invariants (15) and integrate over  $\mathbf{v}$ , the right-hand side does not contribute to the outcome, and we are left with

$$\partial_t \rho + \nabla \cdot (\rho \mathbf{u}) = 0, \quad (17)$$

$$\partial_t \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} = -\rho^{-1} \nabla \cdot \mathbb{P} - \nabla \phi, \quad (18)$$

$$\frac{3}{2} \rho R (\partial_t T + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla T) = -\mathbb{P} : \nabla \mathbf{u} - \nabla \cdot \mathbf{q}, \quad (19)$$

where  $\nabla$  means  $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}$ . Here the pressure tensor  $\mathbb{P}$  and heat flux  $\mathbf{q}$  are defined as

$$\mathbb{P} := \int m \mathbf{c} \mathbf{c} f \, d^3v, \quad \mathbf{q} := \int \frac{1}{2} m c^2 \mathbf{c} f \, d^3v. \quad (20)$$

We see that the form of the macroscopic equations is just that of the usual fluid equations. This result is independent of the rarity of the medium. The usefulness of these equations depends entirely on how well we can prescribe the higher-order moments  $\mathbb{P}$  and  $\mathbf{q}$ . A standard way to proceed is to solve (6) approximately for  $f$ . We shall follow this route also, but will deviate from the normally used prescription at a certain point.

We let  $f = f_0 + \tau f_1 + \dots$  and look first at order  $\tau^0$ . We find that  $\mathcal{C}[f_0] = 0$ , and the solution  $f_0$  is the Maxwell–Boltzmann equilibrium (12). From (20), we see that  $\mathbb{P}_0 = p \mathbb{I}$  and  $\mathbf{q}_0 = 0$ , where the scalar pressure is given by  $p := \rho R T$ . If we stop at this order, Equations (17)–(19) are then the Euler equations for an ideal fluid.

At order  $\tau^1$ , it is convenient to factor out the Maxwell–Boltzmann solution from  $f_1$  and write the equation to be solved as

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}} \tilde{f}_1 = \mathcal{D} \ln f_0, \quad (21)$$

where  $\tilde{f}_1 := f_1/f_0$  and

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}} \tilde{f} := -\mathbf{c} \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{c}} \tilde{f} + R T \nabla_{\mathbf{c}} \cdot (\nabla_{\mathbf{c}} \tilde{f}). \quad (22)$$

The right-hand side of (21) may be written out as

$$\mathcal{D} \left[ -\frac{c^2}{2RT} + \ln \frac{n}{(2\pi RT)^{3/2}} \right] = -\frac{1}{RT} \mathbf{c} \cdot \mathcal{D} \mathbf{c} + \left( \frac{c^2}{2RT} - \frac{3}{2} \right) \mathcal{D} \ln T + \mathcal{D} \ln \rho. \quad (23)$$

We note that

$$\mathcal{D} \mathbf{c} = -\nabla \phi - D\mathbf{u}/Dt - \mathbf{c} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}, \quad \text{where} \quad D/Dt := \partial_t + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla. \quad (24)$$

The operator  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}$  maps polynomials in  $\mathbf{c}$  to polynomials of the same degree so, given the form of (23), we may seek a solution  $\tilde{f}_1$  to (21) as a cubic in  $\mathbf{c}$ . We write

$$\tilde{f}_1 = \mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b}_i c^i + \mathbf{c}_{ij} c^i c^j + \mathbf{d}_{ijk} c^i c^j c^k, \quad (25)$$

where  $\mathbf{a}$ ,  $\mathbf{b}$ ,  $\mathbf{c}$  and  $\mathbf{d}$  are functions of  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $t$ , and symmetric in their indices; repeated indices are summed. Inserting (25) into the left-hand side of (21), we obtain

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}\tilde{f}_1 = -3\mathbf{d}_{ijk} c^i c^j c^k - 2\mathbf{c}_{ij} c^i c^j + (6RT\mathbf{d}_{i\ell\ell} - \mathbf{b}_i) c^i + 2RT\mathbf{c}_{\ell\ell}. \quad (26)$$

There is no  $\mathbf{a}$  term because it is annihilated by the Fokker–Planck collision operator. We now equate coefficients of  $\mathbf{c}$  between (26) and (23), and find

$$\mathbf{d}_{ijk} = -\frac{1}{18RT} (\delta_{ij} \nabla_{x^k} \ln T + \delta_{ik} \nabla_{x^j} \ln T + \delta_{kj} \nabla_{x^i} \ln T), \quad (27)$$

$$\mathbf{c}_{ij} = -\frac{1}{4RT} \left[ (\nabla_{x^j} u_i + \nabla_{x^i} u_j) + \frac{D \ln T}{Dt} \delta_{ij} \right], \quad (28)$$

$$\mathbf{b}_i = -\frac{1}{6} \nabla_{x^i} \ln T - \frac{1}{RT} \left( \nabla_{x^i} \phi + \frac{Du_i}{Dt} \right) - \nabla_{x^i} \ln \rho. \quad (29)$$

Since  $\mathbf{a}$  is still unspecified, we may use it to satisfy the matching condition (16)  $\int f_1 d^3v = 0$ , resulting from mass conservation. Only the terms even in  $\mathbf{c}$  contribute, and we find

$$\int f_1 d^3v = n(RT \mathbf{c}_{\ell\ell} + \mathbf{a}) = 0, \quad (30)$$

which allows us to solve for  $\mathbf{a}$  in terms of the trace of  $\mathbf{c}$ .

The pressure tensor and heat flux (20) are then obtained from  $f_1$  by performing straightforward Gaussian integrals, and we get

$$P_{ij} = p \delta_{ij} + 2pRT \mathbf{c}_{ij}, \quad q_k = \frac{1}{2} pRT (5\mathbf{b}_k + 21RT \mathbf{d}_{k\ell\ell}). \quad (31)$$

The  $\mathbf{a}$  term is absent from the pressure because we used the density matching condition (30). From (31) and (28), we find that the pressure tensor can be written

$$\mathbb{P} = p \mathbb{I} - 2\mu \mathbb{E} - \mu \left( \frac{D \ln T}{Dt} + \frac{2}{3} \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} \right) \mathbb{I} \quad (32)$$

to first order in  $\tau$ , where the viscosity  $\mu := \frac{1}{2} p \tau$ , and

$$E_{ij} := \frac{1}{2} (\nabla_{x^j} u_i + \nabla_{x^i} u_j - \frac{2}{3} \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} \delta_{ij}) \quad (33)$$

is the rate-of-strain tensor in traceless form.

From (31), (27), and (29), to first order in  $\tau$ , the heat flux is

$$\mathbf{q} = -\eta \nabla T - 3\eta T \left[ \nabla \ln p + \frac{1}{RT} \left( \frac{D\mathbf{u}}{Dt} + \nabla \phi \right) \right] \quad (34)$$

where the thermal conductivity  $\eta := (5/6)p \tau R$ .

These results differ from those of the usual Navier–Stokes equations for which  $\mathbb{P} = p\mathbb{I} - 2\mu\mathbb{E}$  and  $\mathbf{q} = -\eta\nabla T$ . To get some understanding of the import of the additional terms found here we introduce the specific entropy

$$S = C_v \ln(p\rho^{-5/3}), \quad (35)$$

where  $C_v := 3R/2$  is the specific heat at constant volume. Since

$$\dot{S} := \frac{DS}{Dt} = C_v \left[ \frac{D \ln T}{Dt} + \frac{2}{3} \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} \right], \quad (36)$$

we find that

$$\mathbb{P} = p \left( 1 - \frac{\tau}{2C_v} \dot{S} \right) \mathbb{I} - 2\mu\mathbb{E} + \mathcal{O}(\tau^2), \quad (37)$$

$$\mathbf{q} = -\eta\nabla T + 3(\eta T/p)\nabla \cdot \mathbb{T} + \mathcal{O}(\tau^2), \quad (38)$$

with  $\mathbb{T} := (\mathbb{P} - p\mathbb{I})$ . If we put these results into  $\dot{S}$ , we obtain

$$\dot{S} = -\frac{2C_v}{3p} [\mathbb{T} : \nabla \mathbf{u} + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{q}]. \quad (39)$$

Hence  $\dot{S}$  can be seen to be  $\mathcal{O}(\tau)$  and so the additional terms in the pressure tensor are  $\mathcal{O}(\tau^2)$ . A similar argument may be made for the new terms in the heat flux. Though these terms do not appear in the conventional fluid equations, they can be quite significant when the mean free paths are long.

If we eliminate the entropy using

$$\frac{1}{C_v} \dot{S} = \frac{\dot{p}}{p} - \frac{5}{3} \frac{\dot{\rho}}{\rho} \quad (40)$$

we encounter the combination  $p(t) - \frac{1}{2}\tau\dot{p}(t)$  which are the first two terms of a Taylor series of  $p$  in  $\tau/2$ . We may then write

$$\mathbb{P} = p(t - \frac{1}{2}\tau)\mathbb{I} + \frac{10}{3}\mu\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}\mathbb{I} - 2\mu\mathbb{E} + \mathcal{O}(\tau^2). \quad (41)$$

We see that our procedure has taken account of the physical fact that the medium senses what particles were doing one collision time prior to the present time but is not yet aware of what they are doing at the present.

#### IV. THE JEANS INSTABILITY

As an application of the equations of motion (17)–(19), we will use them together with the pressure tensor and heat flux derived in Section III to examine the Jeans criterion for gravitational instability. This instability, describing the gravitational collapse of a homogeneous medium, was first investigated by Jeans (1929). He found that perturbations above a critical wavelength (the Jeans length) were unstable to gravitational collapse, but that shorter wavelengths were unaffected due to the large-scale nature of the gravitational force. The Jeans length is the ratio of the adiabatic sound speed  $a_s$  to the gravitational

frequency  $\sqrt{4\pi G\rho}$ . Pacholczyk and Stodólkiewicz (1959) and Kato and Kumar (1960) investigated the effect of viscosity and thermal conductivity on the instability and found that the collapse occurs above a critical wavelength given by the ratio of the isothermal sound speed  $a_T$  to the gravitational frequency. That critical wavelength is slightly larger than in the ideal case, which involves the adiabatic sound speed. Their interpretation for the increase in critical wavelength is that temperature gradients are adverse to the collapse, and a nonzero thermal conductivity allows the smoothing out of these gradients through very slow displacements of the medium; the mode is thus isothermal.

We will now investigate how the gravitational instability occurs in our set of equations. We take as our equilibrium a medium at rest and with uniform density  $\rho_0$  and temperature  $T_0$ . We expand each fluid variable into an equilibrium piece and a small perturbation,

$$\rho = \rho_0(1 + \varphi), \quad T = T_0(1 + \theta), \quad p = \rho RT = p_0(1 + \varpi), \quad \varpi = \varphi + \theta. \quad (42)$$

The gravitational potential  $\phi$  in (18) is obtained from the Poisson equation

$$\Delta\phi = 4\pi G(\rho - \rho_0), \quad (43)$$

where we choose  $-\rho_0$  as a background “neutralising” density in order to have a proper uniform equilibrium about which to expand; the equilibrium velocity then vanishes. The density  $-\rho_0$  is a repulsion term and may be regarded as a Newtonian analogue of Einstein’s cosmological constant. To leave it out as Jeans did and jump straight to the linearised equation (47) below is expedient but questionable.

The linearised equations of motion (17)–(19) and Poisson equation (43) are

$$\partial_t \varphi + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0, \quad (44)$$

$$\rho_0 \partial_t \mathbf{u} + \nabla \cdot \mathbb{P} = -\rho_0 \nabla \phi, \quad (45)$$

$$\frac{3}{2} p_0 \partial_t \theta + p_0 \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{q} = 0, \quad (46)$$

$$\Delta\phi = 4\pi G \rho_0 \varphi. \quad (47)$$

The pressure tensor  $\mathbb{P}$  is given by (32) and the heat flux  $\mathbf{q}$  by (34). We take the divergence of the velocity equation (45) and use the continuity equation (44) to eliminate  $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}$ ,

$$\rho_0 \partial_t^2 \varphi - \nabla \nabla : \mathbb{P} = 4\pi G \rho_0^2 \varphi, \quad (48)$$

where we also used the Poisson equation (47) to eliminate  $\phi$ . We then need to take two divergences of the linearised pressure tensor,

$$\nabla \nabla : \mathbb{P} = p_0 \Delta(\varphi + \theta) + \mu(2\partial_t \Delta\varphi - \partial_t \Delta\theta). \quad (49)$$

We introduce the isothermal sound speed  $a_T$ , the kinematic viscosity  $\nu$ , and the thermal diffusivity  $\kappa$ , through

$$a_T^2 := \frac{p_0}{\rho_0}, \quad \nu := \frac{\mu}{\rho_0}, \quad \kappa := \frac{\eta}{\rho_0 C_p} = \frac{\eta}{\frac{5}{2} R \rho_0}. \quad (50)$$

Then, on inserting (49) into (48), we obtain

$$\partial_t^2 \varphi = a_T^2 \Delta(\varphi + \theta) + \nu(2\partial_t \Delta\varphi - \partial_t \Delta\theta) + \frac{5}{3} k_J^2 a_T^2 \varphi, \quad (51)$$



where the Jeans wavenumber is given by

$$k_J^2 := \frac{4\pi G \rho_0}{a_S^2} = \frac{3}{5} \frac{4\pi G \rho_0}{a_T^2}. \quad (52)$$

Next, we take the divergence of the linearised heat flux,

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{q} = -\eta T_0 \Delta \theta - 3\eta T_0 a_T^{-2} [\partial_t \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} + \Delta \phi + a_T^2 \Delta(\varphi + \theta)], \quad (53)$$

and insert this into the temperature equation (46),

$$\partial_t \theta - \frac{2}{3} \partial_t \varphi - \frac{5}{3} \kappa a_T^{-2} [4a_T^2 \Delta \theta - 3(\partial_t^2 \varphi - \frac{5}{3} k_J^2 a_T^2 \varphi - a_T^2 \Delta \varphi)] = 0, \quad (54)$$

where again we eliminated  $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}$  using the continuity equation (44), and used the definition (50) of the thermal diffusivity  $\kappa$ .

Equations (51) and (54) are the equations required to derive a dispersion relation for the gravitational instability. It is convenient to use the viscous time  $\mu/p_0$  as unit of time and  $a_T \mu/p_0$  as unit of length. Recycling the same symbols for the dimensionless quantities turns equations (51) and (54) into

$$(\partial_t^2 - \Delta - 2\partial_t \Delta - \frac{5}{3} k_J^2) \varphi + (\partial_t - 1) \Delta \theta = 0, \quad (55)$$

$$(3\partial_t - \frac{40}{3} \Delta) \theta + (-2\partial_t + 10(\partial_t^2 - \frac{5}{3} k_J^2 - \Delta)) \varphi = 0. \quad (56)$$

On letting  $\varphi, \theta \sim \exp(ikx + \gamma t)$ , we find the dispersion relation

$$(\frac{3}{5} + 2k^2) \gamma^3 + \frac{22}{15} k^2 \gamma^2 + [\frac{22}{3} k^4 + (1 - \frac{10}{3} k_J^2) k^2 - k_J^2] \gamma + \frac{2}{3} (k^2 - \frac{5}{3} k_J^2) k^2 = 0, \quad (57)$$

which may be compared to the expression obtained from Navier–Stokes by Kato & Kumar (1960),

$$\frac{3}{5} \gamma^3 + \frac{22}{15} k^2 \gamma^2 + (\frac{8}{9} k^4 + k^2 - k_J^2) \gamma + \frac{2}{3} (k^2 - \frac{5}{3} k_J^2) k^2 = 0, \quad (58)$$

with the Fokker–Planck values for the viscosity and thermal diffusivity inserted into their result. In each case the system is marginally stable with  $\gamma = 0$  at  $k^2 = (5/3)k_J^2$ , and is damped for larger  $k$ . This is illustrated in Fig. 1. For  $k = 0$ , both dispersion relations predict a growth rate of  $\gamma(k = 0) = \sqrt{5/3} k_J$  in dimensionless units, which with dimensions is  $\sqrt{4\pi G \rho_0}$ . This is consistent with the fact that dissipation is unimportant at large scales, so the growth rate at  $k = 0$  involves only the gravitational time.

The asymptotic growth rate as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  is  $-3/4$  for Navier–Stokes and  $-1/11$  for our system, independent of  $k$ . (Multiply by  $\mu/p_0$  to recover dimensions.) Thus, at large wavenumbers, the modes tend to be uniformly damped, both in our case and for Navier–Stokes. This is because at large  $k$  the fluid behaves like a Stokes flow, where we can ignore the inertial and gravitational terms completely, and the balance is between the Laplacian of the pressure and the viscosity, which have the same number of spatial derivatives; hence the lack of dependence on  $k$ . For our case (the equations of Section III) there is a contribution from the new terms that shifts the damping rate considerably closer to marginality.

Coexisting with the real root associated with the instability, there is also a pair of unconditionally damped roots. The real part of these roots is plotted in Fig. 2. At  $k = 0$  one of these roots is marginal (real part of growth rate equal to zero) and is an *isopycnal* mode (constant density). However, this mode is never destabilised and its growth rate immediately decreases as  $k$  increases away from zero.




FIG. 1 Growth rate  $\gamma$  as a function of wavenumber  $k$ , for Navier–Stokes (dashed line) and the equations derived in Section III (solid). The growth rate of this mode is real and, in both cases, damping sets in above the isothermal Jeans wavenumber  $(5/3)k_J^2$  (here we have taken  $k_J = 1$  in dimensionless units).

For small  $k$  the two damped roots are distinct and real, but they come together at larger  $k$  and become a complex-conjugate pair with nonzero imaginary part (not plotted), indicating oscillatory behaviour. The Navier–Stokes case (dashed line) is seen to have heavily damped complex roots at large wavenumber.<sup>1</sup> But for our system of equation (solid line), the growth rate actually increases a little, looking as though it may be headed for a Hopf bifurcation (*i.e.*, overstability, where the real part of the growth rate becomes positive at nonzero imaginary part), before leveling off at an asymptotic value of the damping rate given by  $-53/165 \simeq -0.3212$ . Indeed, it can be shown that there is no Hopf bifurcation for any realisable parameter values in our equations, but the fact that the complex modes are somewhat “destabilised” by the new terms is intriguing (this is also true to a lesser extent for the real mode described above). This destabilisation has its source in the  $k^2$  coefficient of the  $\gamma^3$  term in the dispersion relation (57), which is not present in Navier–Stokes, but its physical significance is not yet apparent to us.

## V. CONCLUSION

The basic approach in this as in other derivations of fluid equations from kinetic theory is to write the general moment equations (17)–(19). These are the fluid equations and, to complete them, we need closure relations for the pressure tensor and heat flux. This is an issue astronomers are familiar with from the study of radiative transfer. For the purpose, we could invent a phenomenological approximation as Eddington did in radiative transfer or we

<sup>1</sup> In the Navier–Stokes system the complex roots come together again at very large  $k$ , but the growth rate continues to decrease with  $k$ .




FIG. 2 Real part of the two complex roots  $\gamma$  as a function of wavenumber  $k$ , for Navier–Stokes (dashed line) and the equations derived in Section III (solid). Large wavenumbers are much more strongly damped for Navier–Stokes than in the system derived here.

may pursue approximate solutions of the kinetic theory as Hilbert did by expanding in the collision time. The Hilbert expansion was developed by Chapman and Enskog in deriving the Navier–Stokes equations (Uhlenbeck and Ford, 1963) and we have pursued that line as well following earlier work (Chen, 2000; Chen *et al.*, 2000, 2001) based on the relaxation model of kinetic theory (Bhatnager *et al.*, 1954; Welander, 1954). However, in that latter work, as here, we depart from the Chapman–Enskog approach in an essential way in not using results from lower orders to simplify the results in the current order.

To express this idea in equations, let us consider what happens in general in such problems in the first order. Once we have expressed the one-particle distribution function as  $f = f_0(1 + \tau\varphi)$  where  $\tau$  is the (small) collision time, we are led to an equation for  $\varphi$  in the form

$$\mathcal{L}\varphi = \mathcal{D}f_0 + \mathcal{O}(\tau) \quad (59)$$

where  $\mathcal{L}$  is the linearisation of the collision operator. In general,  $\mathcal{L}$  is self-adjoint, as it is in the present study. Then  $\mathcal{L}\psi^\alpha = 0$  implies  $\int \psi^\alpha \mathcal{L}\varphi d\mathbf{v} = 0$  and so we must have

$$\int \psi^\alpha [\mathcal{D}f_0] d\mathbf{v} = \mathcal{O}(\tau). \quad (60)$$

Since  $\psi^\alpha$  represents the collisionally invariant quantities, the fluid equations to the current order may serve as the solvability condition (60).

In the Chapman–Enskog procedure, this solvability condition is taken to be a lower order version of the fluid equations, here the Euler equation, and it is used to simplify the right side of (59). Then, the results are used in the general fluid equations. For both of these two conditions to be satisfied, we require  $\tau$  to be very small indeed.

What we are doing here is to say that, to the first order, the fluid equations themselves are a realisation of condition (60) and that it is redundant to apply the same condition twice,

once with  $O(\tau)$  retained and once with it omitted, as one does in the Chapman–Enskog method. Rather, we simply use the full condition (60) as a compatibility condition. It is for this reason that, in the first order theory, we allow ourselves to differ from the Chapman–Enskog results by terms  $O(\tau^2)$ . In particular, we have for the trace of the pressure tensor

$$\text{Tr } \mathbb{P} = 3p \left( 1 - \frac{\tau}{2C_v} \dot{S} \right) + O(\tau^2). \quad (61)$$

This result differs from the exact trace ( $3p$ ) by  $O(\tau^2)$  and this, we suggest is allowed in a first order-theory.

We may add that in comparing the results of this approach to experiments on ultrasound we find that they do better than the usual Navier–Stokes version. Here we have an interesting example of a dictum of J. B. Keller: “Two theories may have the same accuracy but different domains of validity.”

We regret that though, in honour of Douglas Gough’s birthday, we have gone to second order in this approach (for only the relaxation model so far), we could not fit the derivations into the space we were allotted in this volume. So those results will have to be presented elsewhere. We are happy to report that, in that next order, the trace of our pressure tensor differs from the exact trace by  $O(\tau^3)$ . For now we must be content with mentioning that result and presenting our best wishes to Douglas on his birthday.

## References

- Bhatnager, P. L., E. P. Gross, and M. Krook, 1954, *Phys. Rev.* **94**, 511.
- Chen, X., 2000, *Transport Problems of Astrophysical Interest*, Ph.D. thesis, Columbia University Astronomy Department.
- Chen, X., H. Rao, and E. A. Spiegel, 2000, *Phys. Lett. A* **271**, 87.
- Chen, X., H. Rao, and E. A. Spiegel, 2001, *Phys. Rev. E* **64**(4), 046308.
- Clemmow, P. C., and J. P. Dougherty, 1969, *Electrodynamics of Particles and Plasmas* (Addison-Wesley, Reading, Mass.).
- Cohen, E. G. D., 1997, *Mathematical Models and Methods in Applied Sciences* **7**, 909.
- Griv, E., M. Gedalin, and D. Eichler, 2001, *Astrophys. J.* **555**, L29.
- Jeans, J. H., 1929, *Astronomy and Cosmogony* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, U.K.).
- Kato, S., and S. S. Kumar, 1960, *Pub. Astro. Soc. Japan* **12**(3), 290.
- Ogorodnikov, K. F., 1965, *Dynamics of stellar systems* (Pergamon, New York).
- Pacholczyk, A. G., and J. S. Stodółkiewicz, 1959, *Bulletin de l’Académie Polonaise des Sciences* **7**(11).
- Rosenbluth, M. N., W. M. MacDonald, and D. L. Judd, 1957, *Phys. Rev.* **107**(1), 1.
- Spiegel, E. A., 1998, in *On Einstein’s Path: Essays in Honor of Engelbert Schucking*, edited by A. Harvey (Springer-Verlag, New York), pp. 465–474.
- Uhlenbeck, G. E., and G. W. Ford, 1963, *Lectures in Statistical Mechanics* (American Mathematical Society, Providence, Rhode Island).
- Welander, P., 1954, *Ark. f. Fysik* **7**, 507.